UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/505
15 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 13 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ERITREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit a press release issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Eritrea on 13 June 1998 concerning Ethiopia's declared decision and measures against Eritreans resident in Ethiopia and Ethiopian citizens of Eritrean origin.

I should be grateful if you would kindly circulate this letter and its annex as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Haile MENKERIOS
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-16727 (E) 150698

/...

Annex

Press release issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Eritrea on 13 June 1998

The Ethiopian Government yesterday, 12 June 1998, decided to expel Eritreans residing in Ethiopia, while others are being fired from their jobs.

The Eritreans who are being expelled are permanent residents who have lived in Ethiopia for decades. Many of them hold Ethiopian citizenship.

The official Ethiopian statement said that the Eritreans were being expelled en masse because they posed a security threat to Ethiopia. The true intention, however, is to create discord between the two peoples.

At the same time thousands of Eritreans are being arrested arbitrarily by the Ethiopian authorities.

The Government of Eritrea strongly deplores this irresponsible act of the Ethiopian Government. It calls upon the international community to denounce Ethiopia's act and to take the necessary action to guarantee the rights and well-being of these innocent civilians.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/506
15 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 2 JUNE 1998 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I write with reference to the letter dated 31 March 1998 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council regarding developments in Bougainville (S/1998/287) and to the subsequent statement made by the President of the Security Council on 22 April 1998 on behalf of the Council (S/PRST/1998/10). In that statement, the Council strongly supported the Agreement on Peace, Security and Development on Bougainville, signed at Lincoln University, New Zealand, on 23 January 1998 and, noting that the Agreement called for the United Nations to play a role in Bougainville, requested me to consider the composition and financial modalities of such involvement by the United Nations.

Concurrently with his letter to the President of the Security Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, Mr. Roy Yaki, wrote to me on 30 March requesting that I deploy a United Nations observer mission to monitor implementation of arrangements concluded in the Lincoln Agreement. Following receipt of this letter and of a subsequent letter addressed to me by the Papua New Guinea Special State Negotiator for Bougainville, Sir John Kaputin, inviting me on behalf of his Government to be represented at the signing ceremony of the Agreement Covering Implementation of the Ceasefire to be held at Arawa, Bougainville, on 30 April, I requested Mr. Francesc Vendrell, Director of the Asia and the Pacific Division of the Department of Political Affairs to represent me at the ceremony and, at the same time, to head a mission to assess how the United Nations could best carry out the functions assigned to it by the parties to the Lincoln and Arawa Agreements. (The Arawa Agreement is attached as an annex to the present letter.)

After examining the assessment mission's report, I have reached the conclusion that a United Nations presence in Bougainville would provide added confidence to the parties to the Agreement, facilitate the tasks assigned to the Peace Monitoring Group and assist in the promotion of the political process to which the parties to the Agreements have committed themselves. I might add that this conclusion is fully shared, not only by the parties, but also by the Governments contributing to the Peace Monitoring Group. I therefore wish to inform the Security Council of my willingness to respond positively to the requests from the parties and of my intention, if the Security Council has no

objection, to establish a United Nations Political Office in Bougainville, based in Arawa. I will keep the Council regularly informed of the work of the Office. The Office will perform the following functions, as spelled out in the Lincoln and Arawa Agreements:

(a) Work in conjunction with the Peace Monitoring Group, while maintaining the right to make its own observations and assessments;

(b) Monitor and report on the implementation of the Lincoln and Arawa Agreements, including the activities of the Peace Monitoring Group in relation to its mandate;

(c) Chair the Peace Process Consultative Committee, which comprises representatives of the parties and which the States contributing to the Peace Monitoring Group will be invited to attend. The functions of the Peace Process Consultative Committee include consulting on all aspects of the ceasefire and on breaches thereof, developing plans for the phased withdrawal of the Papua New Guinea Defence Force (PNGDF) and of the Mobile Riot Squad of the Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary, developing plans for the disposal of weapons and promoting public awareness and understanding of the peace process;

(d) Assist in other areas as agreed by the parties to the Agreements.

The Office would be headed by a Director and composed of two political and two military advisers plus international and local support staff. The associated financial implications of the Office are estimated at approximately $1.4 million for the period from June to December 1998. The financial modalities of this will be a matter for the General Assembly to determine in due course.

I should be grateful if you would kindly make the text of the present letter and its annex available to the members of the Security Council.

(Signed) Kofi A. ANNAN

Annex

Agreement Covering Implementation of the Ceasefire

(Annex I to the Lincoln Agreement)

The Government of Papua New Guinea, the Bougainville Transitional Government, the Bougainville Resistance Force, the Bougainville Interim Government, the Bougainville Revolutionary Army and Bougainville leaders ("the parties"):

(i) Recognizing that the situation on Bougainville has substantially improved following the signing of the Burnham Truce;

(ii) Realizing that this was brought about by the cooperation between all parties, the people of Bougainville and the Truce Monitoring Group in observing the terms of the truce;

(iii) Desiring that this same spirit of cooperation be maintained and continued;

(iv) Realizing that the Lincoln Agreement on Peace, Security and Development on Bougainville is the basis for the Agenda for ongoing consultation and negotiation between the parties, which Agreement needs to be implemented;

hereby agree to the following arrangements:

PART I. CEASEFIRE

1. Permanent and irrevocable ceasefire

A permanent and irrevocable ceasefire will come into effect on Bougainville at 2400 hours on 30 April 1998.

2. Terms of the ceasefire

2.1 As from that hour all parties will continue to refrain from all hostile acts or the carriage or possession and the use of arms, ammunition, explosives and other instruments of death, injury or destruction on Bougainville.

2.2 No one will manufacture, trade or distribute weapons in Bougainville.

2.3 The parties will cooperate in reporting and preventing the use, manufacture, importation, sale, trade and exchange of weapons and ammunition.

2.4 People will be allowed to move freely without hindrance in Bougainville.

PART II. NEUTRAL REGIONAL PEACE MONITORING GROUP AND UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER MISSION

3. Neutral regional Peace Monitoring Group

3.1 The Papua New Guinea Government, in consultation with the parties, will negotiate an agreement based on the Agreement concerning the Regional Truce Monitoring Group to establish a neutral regional Peace Monitoring Group.

3.2 The parties agree that Papua New Guinea will invite Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Vanuatu and other countries in the region to participate in the neutral regional Peace Monitoring Group.

4. Mandate of the Peace Monitoring Group

The parties agree that the Peace Monitoring Group will carry out the following mandate:

(i) Monitor and report on compliance with all aspects of the ceasefire;

(ii) Promote and instil confidence in the peace process through its presence, good offices and interaction with people in Bougainville;

(iii) Provide such assistance in implementation of the Lincoln Agreement as the parties to the Lincoln Agreement and the States contributing to the Peace Monitoring Group may agree and available resources allow;

(iv) Cooperate by agreement in ways that assist in the democratic resolution of the situation.

5. United Nations observer mission

5.1 The parties agree that the Papua New Guinea Government will request:

(i) The Security Council to endorse the neutral regional Peace Monitoring Group;

(ii) The Secretary-General to send an observer mission to Bougainville.

5.2 The parties recognize that the United Nations observer mission will work in conjunction with the Peace Monitoring Group while maintaining the right to make its own observations and assessments.

5.3 The mandate of the United Nations observer mission will be to monitor and report on implementation of these arrangements and it may be requested to assist in other areas as agreed by the parties.

PART III. MECHANISM FOR CONSULTATION

6. Peace Process Consultative Committee

6.1 The parties agree to establish a Peace Process Consultative Committee which will replace the Peace Consultative Committee.

6.2 The Papua New Guinea National Government will seek funding for the establishment of a secretariat for the Peace Process Consultative Committee.

7. Membership of the Peace Process Consultative Committee

7.1 The Peace Process Consultative Committee will comprise members from all the parties.

7.2 The United Nations observer mission and the States contributing to the Peace Monitoring Group will be invited to sit at meetings of the Peace Process Consultative Committee.

8. Chairman of the Peace Process Consultative Committee

The parties agree that the Chairman of the Peace Process Consultative Committee will be the leader of the United Nations observer mission or otherwise as may be agreed by the parties.

9. Function of the Peace Process Consultative Committee

The parties agree that the functions of the Peace Process Consultative Committee shall be the following:

(i) To consult with all the parties on aspects of the ceasefire;

(ii) To assist the Peace Monitoring Group to monitor the ceasefire and resolve problems resulting from breaches of the terms of the ceasefire;

(iii) To promote the process by screening and clearing issues arising from the Lincoln Agreement;

(iv) To develop detailed plans for the disposal of weapons;

(v) To develop detailed plans for phased withdrawal of the Papua New Guinea Defence Force and the Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary Mobile Riot Squad;

(vi) To promote public awareness and understanding of the peace process;

(vii) To work with similar bodies at district and local levels to help achieve the same objectives in their respective areas;

(viii) To staff the secretariat.

10. Consultation with the Peace Process Consultative Committee

Recognizing the special situation in Bougainville, the Police Commissioner shall consult with the Peace Process Consultative Committee prior to any order to redeploy the Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary Mobile Riot Squad on Bougainville.

PART IV. CALL-OUT ORDER AND NEUTRAL ZONE

11. Call-out order and neutral zone

11.1 The Special State Negotiator will raise the Government of Papua New Guinea, within seven days of the signing of annex I to the Lincoln Agreement, the following:

(i) Recognition by all parties of the township of Arawa as a demilitarized neutral zone;

(ii) Rescinding of the call-out order to consolidate the ceasefire.

11.2 The first meeting of the Peace Process Consultative Committee shall take place within seven days of the implementation of (i) and (ii) above.

Ceasefire - annex I

This agreement is annex I to the Lincoln Agreement on Peace, Security and Development on Bougainville.

Dated at Arawa this 30th April 1998

(Signed) Sir John KAPUTIN
Special State Negotiator
Papua New Guinea Government

(Signed) Sam AKOITAI
Minister of Bougainville Affairs
Papua New Guinea Government

(Signed) Gerard SINATO
Premier
Bougainville Transitional Government

(Signed) Joseph KABUI
Vice President
Bougainville Interim Government

(Signed) Hilary MASIRIA
Chairman
Bougainville Resistance Force

(Signed) General Sam KAUONA
Commander
Bougainville Revolutionary Army

(Signed) John MOMIS
Member for Bougainville Region
Papua New Guinea Government

(Signed) Michael LAIMO
Member for South Bougainville
Papua New Guinea Government

(Signed) Michael OCIO
Member for North Bougainville
Papua New Guinea Government

WITNESSED BY:

(Signed) Bartholomew ULUFA'ALU
Prime Minister
Government of Solomon Islands

(Signed) Don MACKINNON
Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade
Government of New Zealand

(Signed) Alexander DOWNER
Minister for Foreign Affairs
Government of Australia

(Signed) Bernardo VUNIBOBO
Minister for Foreign Affairs
Government of Fiji

(Signed) Clement LEON
Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs
Government of Vanuatu

(Signed) Francesc VENDRELL
Representative of the Secretary-General

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/507
15 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 15 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to inform you that your letter dated 2 June 1998 (S/1998/506) concerning your intention to establish a United Nations Political Office in Arawa, Bougainville (Papua New Guinea), in response to the request of the Security Council in its presidential statement of 22 April 1998 (S/PRST/1998/10) has been brought to the attention of the members of the Council. They welcome your conclusion on this issue and agree with the intention contained in your letter, taking note that the financial modalities will be handled in accordance with the briefing provided by Under-Secretary-General Prendergast on 11 June 1998.

(Signed) António MONTEIRO
President of the Security Council

98-16715 (E) 150698

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/508
15 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 15 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ERITREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit to you a statement of Eritrea's acceptance of the agreement for a total ban of air strikes by Eritrea and Ethiopia issued on 15 June 1998 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Eritrea.

I should be grateful if you would kindly circulate the present letter and its annex as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Haile MENKERIOS
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-16824 (E) 150698

/...

Annex

Statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Eritrea on 15 June 1998

STATEMENT ON THE AGREEMENT FOR A TOTAL BAN ON AIR STRIKES

The Government of Eritrea has accepted the proposal put forward by the Government of the United States of America yesterday, 14 June 1998, on a total ban of air strikes by both sides. The agreement provides for Eritrea and Ethiopia to "halt immediately the further use of air strikes and the threat of air strikes in their present conflict". The moratorium "will continue indefinitely or until such time as either party concludes that any prospect for a peace process has come to an end and provides a formal, advance notice to the United States Government that it will no longer respect this moratorium".

The Government of Eritrea has consistently been calling for the cessation of hostilities and the demilitarization of the entire boundary to allow for a peaceful resolution of the dispute with Ethiopia. The border conflict was exacerbated by Addis Ababa's recourse to air raids when the Ethiopian air force launched the first air strike against Asmara on 5 June 1998. Eritrea's subsequent deterrent actions against military targets were simply in retaliation and legitimate self-defence. As the Government of Eritrea does not see any sense in the ongoing confrontation in general and the air war in particular, it welcomes this agreement with Ethiopia on a partial cessation of hostilities as a positive and first step towards ending the war and resolving the conflict through peace and legality.

The Government of Eritrea wishes to avail of this occasion to express its gratitude to the Governments of the United States and Italy for their endeavours in this regard.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/509
15 June 1998
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

LETTER DATED 13 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAQ TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit the text of a letter dated 12 June 1998 addressed to you by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, on the subject of the continued Turkish aggression against the territory and airspace of Iraq.

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Nizar HAMDOON
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-16787 (E) 150698 150698

/...

Annex

Letter dated 12 June 1998 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq addressed to the Secretary-General

Further to my letter of 31 May 1998, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the Turkish armed forces are continuing their incursions into the territory of Iraq which began on 22 May 1998, as indicated below:

1. On 31 May 1998, from 8.40 to 11 a.m., the Turkish air force violated the southern part of Iraqi airspace, primarily over the regions of Aqra, Amadiyah and Shaykhan.

2. The incursion extended towards the interior of Iraqi territory, and included the regions of Zakho, Dohuk, Amadiyah, Bikufa, Kami Masi and Khakuk, resulting in ten dead and one wounded among the inhabitants.

The Government of Iraq strongly condemns the acts of aggression and repeated violations perpetrated by the Turkish armed forces, and categorically rejects the pretexts put forward by Turkey to justify the repeated incursions into Iraqi territory.

The pretext of pursuing insurgents against the Turkish Government with a view to putting an end to their activities is designed to allow the Turkish military forces to invade and violate Iraqi territory. Turkey is in the habit of fabricating excuses and vain pretexts to justify its aggressive operations. In parallel, the policy pursued by the Turkish Government, in cooperation with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, of imposing the illegitimate airborne exclusion zone leads to the creation of an abnormal situation in the north of Iraq.

The repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by the Turkish Government constitute a serious violation of Iraq's sovereignty and the inviolability of its territory, contrary to the principles of good-neighbourly relations and the Iraqi-Turkish Boundary Agreement of 1926.

Iraq, while calling on the Turkish Government to withdraw its aggressive forces immediately from Iraqi territory and to refrain in future from such continuing aggressive practices, assigns to Turkey full international responsibility for these acts of aggression perpetrated within Iraqi territory and for all the consequences that may result therefrom, and rejects all the pretexts put forward. The Iraqi Government reserves the possibility of exercising its internationally recognized legitimate right to decide on the appropriate response to be made to this brutal military aggression and to call for reparations for the damage caused by these repeated Turkish acts of aggression and violations of Iraqi territory and airspace and for the human suffering inflicted on Iraqi citizens as a result of these acts.

In addition, the Iraqi Government again calls on the Government of Turkey to reverse its dangerous policy, which clearly contributes to the maintenance of an abnormal situation in the north of Iraq in cooperation with the Governments

of the United States and United Kingdom, as part of the dangerous plan which involves intervention in the internal affairs of Iraq.

In reiterating Iraq's appeal to Turkey, through you, to respect the sovereignty of Iraq and the inviolability of its territory, I hope that the United Nations will assume its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations and will prevent the recourse to threat and aggression to which my country is being subjected.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mohammed Said AL-SAHAF
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/510
15 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 12 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ETHIOPIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit to you a statement on the situation in Somalia, made by Mr. Seyoum Mesfin, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, to the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its sixty-eighth session, held at Ouagadougou from 8 to 10 June 1998.

I should be grateful if you would kindly have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Duri MOHAMMED
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-16813 (E) 160698

/...

Annex

Statement on the situation in Somalia, made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia to the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at its sixty-eighth session, held at Ouagadougou from 8 to 10 June 1998

I would like to thank you for giving me the floor to address the situation in Somalia, which continues to be a major source of concern to our subregion, the Horn of Africa and the continent as a whole.

We have read the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia. We believe that the report describes the prevailing situation accurately and fairly. We are also of the opinion that the recommendations suggested in the report will contribute to our future work in favour of promoting peace and national reconciliation in Somalia.

You will recall that at its sixty-seventh session, held at Addis Ababa in February, the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) reviewed the developments in Somalia and encouraged the efforts of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and Ethiopia, the mandated country. I would like to inform you of developments regarding Somalia over the past four months.

Following the sixty-seventh session of the Council of Ministers, the IGAD Heads of State held their sixth summit meeting in Djibouti on 16 March. Our leaders met at a time when it had become very clear that earlier attempts to bring the Somalis together had failed. After analysing the situation in the country, it was resolved to approach the crisis in a different way.

We in the subregion have realized that faction leaders have not proved to be ready to do what it takes in order to reach agreement in Somalia. We had been earlier working from the premise that an agreement between faction leaders would translate into an accord on national reconciliation. However, in view of the incapacity of faction leaders to make the necessary accommodations, it has now become important to widen our view and broaden the peace process to enable greater participation by Somali civil society.

By Somali civil society we are referring to representatives of religious leaders, clan elders, intellectuals, Somali businessmen, women's groups and others. These are for the most part constituencies of peace in Somalia, and there is a need to identify and contact them and bring them within the orbit of the peace process. Broadening the peace process has the double advantage that it serves the purposes of inclusion, while prodding the faction leaders into coming to terms with one another.

We also agreed in Djibouti on the need for the international community to contribute politically, diplomatically and financially, specifically by assisting the rehabilitation of those regions where faction leaders and their constituencies demonstrate a practical commitment to peace, stability and national reconciliation. We believe that this approach would reward those

embarked on peaceful reconstruction and encourage others to follow suit. In this regard, we called for the activation of the Trust Fund for Somalia at the United Nations and requested the European Union to find ways and means of utilizing monies for this purpose from funds earmarked for Somalia in the Lomé context.

Our leaders also called for looking into the possibilities for creating a mechanism of consultation with all those who are prepared to contribute to the peace process in Somalia on the basis of the IGAD initiative and on conditions that they refrain from engaging in parallel initiatives.

I am certain that you realize very well that the proliferation of initiatives on Somalia was providing one faction leader or another with the possibility to withstand pressure for accommodation and thereby torpedo peace efforts. This is why it was essential that all countries with an interest in supporting the IGAD initiative were provided with the possibility to channel their energies in a supportive and constructive way.

Finally our leaders expressed the will to call an international conference under the auspices of IGAD to maximize the support of the international community for the peace process. The aim of the conference is to include all those who have a stake in peace in Somalia. Therefore, faction leaders, civil groups such as clan elders, representatives of women and youth groups, Somali intellectuals, religious leaders and the business community would need to participate in the conference. As an international forum, the conference is intended to include the international community, namely, countries and organizations that have a role to play in the Somali peace process.

The rationale for holding such a conference should not be difficult to explain. Firstly, it will bring together all the Somali actors. It will demonstrate to faction leaders that there are other actors in the country who are recognized by the international community as an important constituency in today's Somalia. It will also encourage Somali civil society to be more effective, thereby speeding up the normalization of the situation in the country.

With all local actors in the picture there can be no excuse for not participating in the conference. We say this in particular because there will be no exclusivity externally either. All countries and organizations with a role to play will be part of the international conference. So, if it is prepared with the necessary care, as we are confident it will be, it will be possible to have an event that will include everyone, avoiding the pitfalls of any form of exclusivity. And we are hopeful that the conference will come out with an action plan that will facilitate the calibrated use of assistance to Somalia in a way that might push the national reconciliation process forward.

What I have described to you is how we in IGAD saw the way forward on Somalia when we met in Djibouti almost four months ago. We have, since then, been following the evolving situation in Somalia quite closely and working out the next steps in the peace process.

The situation in Somalia continues to be very fluid. In the north-west (Somaliland), there is relative stability, although the worsening economic situation could increase tension and trigger strife. In the north-east, which is also relatively stable, efforts are under way to establish an administration for the Mejertin area described as Puntland. Elsewhere in the south, there are sporadic conflict situations, as alignments shift here and there and where competition for territory and influence is fierce, such as in Kisimayo.

In and around the capital, Mogadishu, despite agreements with the objective of establishing an authority for the area, the jockeying for power has not played itself out yet, and the influence of that problem is felt further inland in the Baidoa area, where former commitments to pull out militia have not been met.

We are wondering where all this might lead, whether this is the actual administrative and political breakup of the country or whether we are witnessing the birth of the building blocks of a new federal Somalia along lines not foreseen in former agreements. We hope that all the constituent parts and units of Somalia will recognize the benefits of moving towards unity, and we will do our best to nudge them in that direction.

Over the past few months, we have witnessed the growing interest of the international community to support the peace process in Somalia. The partners of IGAD grouped in the IGAD Partners Forum formed a Committee on Somalia and met in Rome on 4 May to see how they could best be of assistance. They were joined by Egypt, while the Russian Federation and Greece participated as observers. IGAD was represented by the mandated country, Ethiopia, and the Secretary-General of IGAD.

At the meeting, it was clear that there was general support for the new approach adopted by our subregion to the Somali crisis. There was general agreement that the international community would need to back the regional initiative and to speak with one voice to the Somalis. We have recently learned that our partners have established a liaison group made up of countries and organizations with a strong interest in the outcome in Somalia and that they will be interacting with us as we implement the Djibouti decision.

We in the subregion have always been very much encouraged by the full support of OAU as we work to fulfil the heavy responsibility with which you have entrusted us.

We believe strongly that the Security Council should once again evaluate the situation and pronounce itself on Somalia. We would suggest that the Council:

- Call upon all Somali leaders to rise to the challenge and make the necessary compromises for peace and national reconciliation to take root;

- Endorse the decisions arrived at by IGAD Heads of State and Government at their sixth summit, held in Djibouti on 16 March 1998;

- Call upon OAU member States and the international community to support politically, diplomatically and in other practical ways the regional peace initiative.

UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/52/949
S/1998/511
15 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-second session
Agenda items 36, 37 and 87
QUESTION OF PALESTINE
THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES
AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF
THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER
ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 15 June 1998 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On 11 June 1998, the occupying Israeli army issued an order allowing for the establishment of the so-called civil guards in the Jewish settlements in the West Bank. This dangerous development represents yet another provocative and hostile act by the occupying Power. In addition to its blatant violation of international law, the Fourth Geneva Convention and relevant Security Council resolutions, this act could directly endanger the safety and well-being of the Palestinian civilians in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem. It is obvious that, in practice, these "civil guards" would be an armed militia of extremist and fanatic settlers, serving as a private army or as another occupying army within the occupied territory.

In its resolution 904 (1994) of 18 March 1994, the Security Council, by consensus, called upon Israel, the occupying Power, to continue to take and implement measures, including, inter alia, confiscation of arms, with the aim of preventing illegal acts of violence by Israeli settlers. Clearly, the Israeli authorities are doing the opposite, and they are doing so at a time when the aggression, hostility and violence of the settlers are increasing against the Palestinian people. Further, on the same day, the Israeli army issued another order granting the illegal settlement "Ariel" the formal status of a city, implicitly indicating that it is not a part of the occupied territory anymore. This illegal action serves as yet another confirmation of Israel's expansionist and colonialist policy in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem.

All of these illegal actions must be strongly condemned by the international community, and the Security Council in particular, as the body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, must ensure that the occupying Power reverses such actions and conform with international law and relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on settlements.

I should be grateful if you would arrange to have the present letter distributed as a document of the fifty-second session of the General Assembly, under agenda items 36, 37 and 87, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Nasser AL-KIDWA
Permanent Observer of Palestine
to the United Nations

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/512
15 June 1998
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

LETTER DATED 14 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAQ TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you that 197 mines, bombs, missiles and other ordnance left behind by the 30-Power aggression against Iraq were found and disposed of in various parts of Iraq between 1 April and 31 May 1998. The items included American-made cluster bombs, spherical bombs, air-launched bombs and an artillery shell. They were found in the following governorates: Ninawa, Basrah and Najaf.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Nizar HAMDOON
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-16830 (E) 160698 160698

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/513
15 June 1998
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

LETTER DATED 15 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAQ TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On instructions from my Government, I attach herewith a letter dated 15 June 1998 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq.

I should be grateful if this letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Nizar HAMDOON
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-16871 (E) 160698 160698

/...

Annex

Letter dated 15 June 1998 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq addressed to the President of the Security Council

We have read the results of the discussions that took place in the Security Council in the evening of 11 June 1998, under the item "Other matters", when you raised the subject of the identical Kuwaiti letters of 8 June 1990 addressed to the Security Council and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (S/1998/484 of 9 June 1998) concerning alleged statements attributed to Mr. Taha Yassin Ramadhan, Vice-President of Iraq, concerning the demarcation of the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait. On that occasion, the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States of America indicated that the above-mentioned alleged statements cast doubt on the adherence of Iraq to the Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 833 (1993) regarding the demarcation of the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait, and said that Iraq was again taking a selective attitude to the Council's resolutions and the obligations Iraq has assumed.

On the conclusion of the Council's deliberations, you made a statement to the press as follows: "Concerning Kuwait, the Council expressed its deep concern regarding the statement made by the Vice-President of Iraq, which spreads doubts about Security Council resolution 833 (1993) on the demarcation of the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait".

We express our surprise and disbelief that the deliberations of the Council should have taken place without the members of the Council having read the official text of the statements made by the Vice-President of Iraq, and that you used the expression "deep concern" even before being aware of the views of Iraq.

Obviously, the representatives of the United States of America and the United Kingdom overzealously raised this subject in the Security Council without carefully verifying the accuracy of the statements, and their dangerous political conclusions, which included casting doubt on Iraq's intentions on the basis of inaccurate information, were arrived at in haste, owing to the political designs of the two Governments against Iraq.

You and the members of the Council are aware that Iraq has circulated many letters concerning genuinely serious issues that posed and still pose a real threat to the sovereignty and security of Iraq. Some of these went as far as armed aggression, yet the Security Council did not decide to take them up; it was either completely silent or did not care about these issues. Flagrant examples are the many letters that we sent concerning the aggression by Turkish military forces against Iraqi territory which threatened the security and safety of Iraq; 10 letters have been addressed to the President of the Security Council on this subject, and 21 to the Secretary-General. We have sent more than 27 letters protesting against violations by American and British military aircraft of the sovereignty of Iraqi airspace in the north and south of Iraq; in addition, we have addressed many letters to the Secretary-General concerning the conduct and actions of the Government of the United States of America directed against the security, integrity and territorial unity of Iraq, and concerning

its flagrant interference in Iraq's internal affairs. All of these violations met with complete silence, and the Security Council made no move to condemn these violations or take any appropriate position regarding them.

With respect to the statements attributed to the Vice-President of Iraq about the demarcation of the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait, we wish to state that the Vice-President met with a number of media representatives and spoke at length about the subject of the application of double standards in international relations as a result of the influence of the United States and the United Kingdom, particularly in the Security Council; he mentioned the intervention of the Security Council in demarcating the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait because the Security Council had never previously adopted a resolution on demarcation of a boundary between two States. The Vice-President never referred to the legal value of Security Council resolution 833 (1993). The statements attributed to the Vice-President were published by only one newspaper, which distorted the facts of the press meeting and attributed to the Vice-President statements which he never made. However, representatives of more than 10 newspapers and television stations attended the same meeting. It is worth mentioning that, when the Vice-President learned about these untrue allegations concerning his statements some days later, he made a statement to the Middle East News Agency of Egypt stating that Iraq is known for its strict adherence to all that it has signed and indicating that he had spoken at the press meeting which is the subject of this letter about the conduct of the United States, which is seeking to impose its aggressive aims through the application of double standards. He also indicated that he had not referred in his statement to resolution 833 (1993). Thus what was referred to in the letter of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait as a statement attributed to the Vice-President of Iraq has no basis whatsoever.

The fact that, as the Vice-President said, the Security Council had not previously adopted a resolution concerning demarcation of a boundary between two States was underlined by Iraq at the time when the Security Council was discussing resolution 687 (1991) (document S/PV temporary record of 2981st meeting dated 3 April 1991); also, the representatives of Yemen and Ecuador referred to it in explaining their abstention in the vote on the above resolution, as did the representative of Cuba when he objected to the resolution (S/PV.2981). The representatives of Venezuela and Brazil spoke to the same effect during the discussion of Security Council resolutions 773 (1992) and 833 (1993) (S/PV.3224).

Finally, I wish to assure you that the reference made by the Vice-President of Iraq to the historical aspect of the practice of the Security Council concerning the issue of the boundaries does not mean in any way that Iraq is abandoning its obligations under the resolution demarcating the international boundary between Iraq and Kuwait.

The misrepresentation by the Kuwaiti Minister for Foreign Affairs of the statements made by the Vice-President of Iraq can be explained only as an attempt to deceive the Security Council. Also, the precipitate espousal by the Ambassadors of the United States and Britain of the allegations mentioned in the letter of the Foreign Minister of Kuwait emphasizes once again how lightly these two ambassadors and their Governments take the work of the Security Council, and

how they make use of their membership in it to take, without justification, positions antagonistic to Iraq.

I should be grateful if you would inform the members of the Security Council of this letter and circulate it as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mohammed Said AL-SAHAF
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq

UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/52/950
S/1998/514
16 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-second session
Agenda item 64
COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 10 June 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you the statement of the Australian Prime Minister dated 12 May 1998 and those of the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs dated 14, 28, 29 and 30 May 1998 concerning the conduct of nuclear tests by India and Pakistan.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter, together with its annex, issued as a document of the General Assembly, under item 64, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Penny WENSLEY

ANNEX

Statements made by the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia

Statement made on 12 May 1998 by the Prime Minister of Australia

INDIAN NUCLEAR TESTS

INDIA'S ACTION IN CONDUCTING THREE UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TESTS IS AN ILL-JUDGED STEP WHICH COULD HAVE MOST DAMAGING CONSEQUENCES FOR SECURITY IN SOUTH ASIA AND GLOBALLY.

AUSTRALIA HAS A DIRECT SECURITY INTEREST IN PREVENTING THE PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS. THE INDIAN TESTS ARE IN FLAGRANT DEFIANCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY'S STRONG SUPPORT FOR NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR TESTING. TO DATE, 186 COUNTRIES ARE PARTY TO THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY AND 149 COUNTRIES HAVE SIGNED THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY.

INDIA'S NEIGHBOURS WILL NATURALLY BE CONCERNED ABOUT THE TESTS BUT A NUCLEAR ARMS RACE IS NOT THE WAY TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF MAINTAINING STABILITY IN SOUTH ASIA. THE GOVERNMENT URGES THEM NOT TO RESPOND IN WAYS WHICH WOULD FURTHER DESTABILISE SECURITY IN THE REGION.

THE FOREIGN MINISTER HAS CALLED IN THE INDIAN HIGH COMMISSIONER TODAY TO CONVEY OUR CONDEMNATION OF THE TESTS IN THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE TERMS. THE SAME MESSAGE WILL BE REGISTERED BY OUR HIGH COMMISSION IN NEW DELHI.

THE GOVERNMENT IS RECALLING OUR HIGH COMMISSIONER FROM NEW DELHI FOR CONSULTATIONS. FURTHER ACTION WILL BE DECIDED IN LIGHT OF THOSE CONSULTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES WHICH SHARE OUR CONCERN.

Ministerial media release dated 14 May 1998

AUSTRALIAN RESPONSE TO INDIAN NUCLEAR TESTS

THE GOVERNMENT HAS NOW DECIDED UPON FURTHER AUSTRALIAN ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE OUTRAGEOUS ACTS PERPETRATED BY INDIA IN CONDUCTING NO LESS THAN FIVE NUCLEAR TESTS THIS WEEK. THIS FOLLOWED CONSULTATIONS TODAY WITH AUSTRALIA'S HIGH COMMISSIONER TO INDIA, MR ROB LAURIE, AND REFLECTS THE GOVERNMENT'S CONDEMNATION OF THE WILFUL DISREGARD FOR INTERNATIONAL OPINION IN PROCEEDING WITH A SECOND ROUND OF NUCLEAR TESTS YESTERDAY.

THE GOVERNMENT CONSIDERS THAT INDIA'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE THE MOST DAMAGING CONSEQUENCES FOR SECURITY IN SOUTH ASIA AND GLOBALLY. IT RISKS A REGIONAL ARMS RACE AND IS IN FLAGRANT DEFIANCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY'S STRONG SUPPORT FOR NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION, AS EVIDENCED BY 186 COUNTRIES SIGNING THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY AND 149 COUNTRIES SIGNING THE COMPREHENSIVE (NUCLEAR) TEST BAN TREATY (CTBT). INDIA MUST IMMEDIATELY SIGN THE CTBT, JOIN THE INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME AND FORSWEAR FOREVER THE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY CANNOT LET INDIA'S ACTIONS PASS WITHOUT A STRONG AND SUBSTANTIVE RESPONSE.

AUSTRALIA HAS AND WILL CONTINUE WITH VIGOUR TO USE REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL FORUMS TO MAKE CLEAR AUSTRALIA'S OPPOSITION TO INDIAN NUCLEAR TESTING AND HAS MADE DIRECT REPRESENTATIONS HERE IN AUSTRALIA AND TO THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT IN NEW DELHI TO LEAVE INDIA IN NO DOUBT ABOUT THE STRENGTH OF OUR CONDEMNATION OF ITS DECISION TO CONDUCT NUCLEAR TESTS. IN ADDITION, I RECALLED AUSTRALIA'S HIGH COMMISSIONER TO INDIA FOR CONSULTATIONS.

BUT IN LIGHT OF THE ILL-JUDGED ACTIONS OF INDIA THE GOVERNMENT HAS CONCLUDED THAT FURTHER ACTION IS REQUIRED, BOTH TO REGISTER OUR CONCERN TO THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT AND TO SEND A MESSAGE TO OTHER NATIONS THAT MIGHT BE CONSIDERING THE TESTING OR DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOUT THE CONSEQUENCES OF ANY SUCH ACTION.

/...

IN THIS REGARD THE GOVERNMENT HAS DECIDED TO IMPLEMENT THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS, EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY:

SUSPENSION OF BILATERAL DEFENCE RELATIONS WITH INDIA, INCLUDING THE WITHDRAWAL OF AUSTRALIA'S DEFENCE ADVISER STATIONED IN NEW DELHI, THE CANCELLATION OF SHIP AND AIRCRAFT VISITS, OFFICER EXCHANGES AND OTHER DEFENCE-RELATED VISITS. AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE FORCE PERSONNEL CURRENTLY TRAINING IN INDIA WILL BE WITHDRAWN . AUSTRALIA WILL REQUEST THE IMMEDIATE DEPARTURE OF THREE INDIAN DEFENCE PERSONNEL CURRENTLY AT DEFENCE COLLEGES IN AUSTRALIA;

. SUSPENSION OF NON-HUMANITARIAN AID;

. SUSPENSION OF MINISTERIAL AND SENIOR OFFICIAL VISITS.

IN ADDITION, THE GOVERNMENT WILL TAKE EVERY APPROPRIATE OPPORTUNITY TO REGISTER AUSTRALIA'S STRONG OPPOSITION TO INDIA'S NUCLEAR TESTING PROGRAM AND WILL CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF OTHERS TO PUT AN END TO ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING.

WE CONTINUE TO URGE INDIA'S NEIGHBOURS TO EXERCISE THE UTMOST RESTRAINT IN THE FACE OF THIS PROVOCATION.

Statement made on 28 May 1998 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia

PAKISTAN NUCLEAR TESTS

I STRONGLY CONDEMN THE NUCLEAR TESTS CONDUCTED BY PAKISTAN TODAY. I WILL BE ANNOUNCING TOMORROW THE MEASURES AUSTRALIA WILL TAKE IN RESPONSE TO PAKISTAN'S NUCLEAR TESTS.

AS WITH THE TESTS CONDUCTED BY INDIA, PAKISTAN'S ACTIONS HAVE SERIOUS IMPLICATIONS FOR GLOBAL AND REGIONAL SECURITY AND FLY IN THE FACE OF THE INTERNATIONAL NORM AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING.

PAKISTAN'S DECISION TO TEST HAS BEEN MADE IN SPITE OF THE STRONG INTERNATIONAL CONDEMNATION OF INDIA'S TESTS AND DIRECT PLEAS TO PAKISTAN BY AUSTRALIA AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY TO EXERCISE RESTRAINT AND NOT TO EMULATE INDIA'S REGRETTABLE EXAMPLE.

A NUCLEAR ARMS RACE IN SOUTH ASIA WILL EXACERBATE RATHER THAN SOLVE REGIONAL SECURITY TENSIONS. PAKISTAN AND INDIA SHOULD BOTH SIGN THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY IMMEDIATELY, AND SHOULD THROW THEIR WEIGHT BEHIND INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE A FISSILE MATERIAL CUT-OFF TREATY.

I WILL CONTACT THE PAKISTANI HIGH COMMISSIONER TOMORROW TO CONVEY TO HIM AUSTRALIA'S DEEP DISAPPOINTMENT AND REGRET AND TO URGE HIS GOVERNMENT TO DESIST FROM ANY FURTHER TESTING. THE SAME MESSAGE WILL BE REGISTERED BY OUR HIGH COMMISSION IN ISLAMABAD.

PAKISTAN'S ACTIONS WILL IN NO WAY WEAKEN AUSTRALIA'S DETERMINATION, SHARED BY THE VAST MAJORITY OF GOVERNMENTS AND PEOPLES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, TO SEE AN END TO THE ERA OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS. WE WILL CONTINUE VIGOROUSLY TO PURSUE THIS OBJECTIVE, AND TO URGE PAKISTAN AND INDIA TO JOIN THE INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME.

/...

Statement made on 29 May 1998 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia

PAKISTAN NUCLEAR TESTS

FOLLOWING PAKISTAN'S ILL-ADVISED DECISION TO CONDUCT NUCLEAR TESTS OVERNIGHT, I AM TODAY ANNOUNCING A SERIES OF MEASURES THE AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT WILL APPLY AGAINST PAKISTAN.

THE FOLLOWING MEASURES - SIMILAR TO THOSE IMPOSED ON INDIA - WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IMMEDIATELY:

. RECALL FOR CONSULTATIONS OF OUR HIGH COMMISSIONER FROM ISLAMABAD AS SOON AS POSSIBLE;

. SUSPENSION OF BILATERAL DEFENCE RELATIONS WITH PAKISTAN, INCLUDING THE RECALL OF AUSTRALIA'S DEFENCE ADVISER STATIONED IN ISLAMABAD AND THE CANCELLATION OF OFFICER EXCHANGES AND OTHER DEFENCE-RELATED VISITS. AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE FORCE PERSONNEL CURRENTLY TRAINING IN PAKISTAN WILL BE WITHDRAWN. AUSTRALIA WILL CANCEL ALL PLANNED VISITS TO AUSTRALIA BY PAKISTANI DEFENCE PERSONNEL;

. EXCLUSION OF NON-HUMANITARIAN AID. CONSISTENT WITH MY DECISION TO PRESERVE THE HUMANITARIAN COMPONENT OF THE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO INDIA, THE PROGRAM TO PAKISTAN WILL CONTINUE. HOWEVER, I HAVE CANCELLED MY DECISION TO DOUBLE AID TO PAKISTAN NEXT YEAR. THIS WAS CONTINGENT UPON PAKISTAN REFRAINING FROM TESTING;

- SUSPENSION OF MINISTERIAL AND SENIOR OFFICIAL VISITS;

- WITH MY SUPPORT, THE PRESIDING OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT HAVE DECIDED IT WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE IN THE PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES TO CONTINUE WITH THE VISIT OF THE PAKISTAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION WHICH IS CURRENTLY IN AUSTRALIA. THAT VIEW HAS BEEN CONVEYED TO THE DELEGATION;

- IN ADDITION TO THESE BILATERAL STEPS, AUSTRALIA HAS TAKEN SEVERAL IMMEDIATE STEPS TO RESPOND IN MULTILATERAL FORA TO PAKISTAN'S TESTS, NAMELY (1) CALLING FOR AN EARLY "SPECIAL" SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT TO DISCUSS THE MATTER; (2) TAKING A LEAD IN HAVING THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CTBTO PREPARATORY COMMISSION ISSUE A STATEMENT CONDEMNING THE TESTS ON BEHALF OF PREPCOM MEMBERS; AND (3) SEEKING A SPECIAL ITEM ON NUCLEAR TESTING AT THE JUNE BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING OF THE IAEA.

I SPOKE THIS MORNING WITH THE PAKISTAN HIGH COMMISSIONER TO CONVEY TO HIM AUSTRALIA'S STRONG CONDEMNATION OF HIS COUNTRY'S ACTION. PAKISTAN'S ACTION IS A FLAGRANT DEFIANCE OF INTERNATIONAL NON-PROLIFERATION NORMS AND HAS SERIOUS IMPLICATIONS FOR GLOBAL AND REGIONAL SECURITY. IT IS SAD AND DEEPLY DISAPPOINTING THAT PAKISTAN HAS TURNED ITS BACK ON THE DIRECT PLEAS OF AUSTRALIA AND OTHERS TO EXERCISE RESTRAINT. INSTEAD PAKISTAN HAS DECIDED TO JOIN INDIA IN ISOLATION FROM THE REST OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY.

I CALL AGAIN ON BOTH PAKISTAN AND INDIA IMMEDIATELY TO SIGN AND RATIFY THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY WITHOUT CONDITION, AND ACCEDE TO THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY.

THE SAME MESSAGE WILL BE REGISTERED BY OUR HIGH COMMISSION IN ISLAMABAD.

I REITERATE THAT IT IS DEEPLY DISAPPOINTING THAT, IN THE FACE OF OUR DIRECT REPRESENTATIONS, PAKISTAN HAS CHOSEN A COURSE OF ACTION WHICH CASTS SUCH A MAJOR SHADOW ON WHAT HAD OTHERWISE BEEN A POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP.

Statement made on 30 May 1998 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia

PAKISTAN NUCLEAR TESTS

I STRONGLY CONDEMN THE CONDUCT OF FURTHER NUCLEAR TESTS BY PAKISTAN. I AM PROFOUNDLY DISAPPOINTED THAT PAKISTAN HAS SEEN FIT TO ADD TO THE FOLLY OF ITS TESTS ON 28 MAY. IT IS DEEPLY REGRETTABLE THAT THE PAKISTANI GOVERNMENT HAS SHOWN ABSOLUTE DISREGARD FOR THE MANY, DIRECT APPEALS TO EXERCISE RESTRAINT, AND HAS WILFULLY TURNED ITS BACK ON THE SINCERE EFFORTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY TO ENCOURAGE REASON TO PREVAIL. THIS ACTION DEFIES THE HOPES OF PEOPLE EVERYWHERE FOR A WORLD FREE OF NUCLEAR TESTING.

I ANNOUNCED ON 29 MAY THE MEASURES AUSTRALIA HAS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO THE FIRST SET OF PAKISTANI NUCLEAR TESTS. THE SECOND SET ONLY STRENGTHENS THE GOVERNMENT'S DETERMINATION THAT ANY NUCLEAR TESTING COUNTRY SHOULD BEAR THE FULL WEIGHT OF THE INTENSE INTERNATIONAL OPPROBRIUM SUCH ACTS DESERVE.

A NUCLEAR ARMS RACE IN SOUTH ASIA WOULD NOT SIMPLY THREATEN THE SECURITY OF THE IMMEDIATE REGION. IT WOULD ALSO HAVE SERIOUS IMPLICATIONS FOR GLOBAL SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS. AUSTRALIA STRONGLY URGES PAKISTAN AND INDIA TO CEASE THEIR DANGEROUS ACTS OF BRINKMANSHIP.

I CALL ON BOTH COUNTRIES TO RENOUNCE NUCLEAR TESTING AND IMMEDIATELY SIGN AND RATIFY THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY, TO JOIN IMMEDIATELY THE INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME, AND TO PARTICIPATE IN THE NEGOTIATION OF A "CUT-OFF" TREATY BANNING THE PRODUCTION OF FISSILE MATERIAL FOR EXPLOSIVE PURPOSES.

THE AUSTRALIAN GEOLOGICAL SURVEY ORGANISATION DETECTED AN UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR EXPLOSION THAT TOOK PLACE AT 16:55 (AUSTRALIAN EASTERN STANDARD TIME) ON 30 MAY IN SOUTHWESTERN PAKISTAN. PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES INDICATE THAT THE YIELD OF THE EXPLOSION WAS LESS THAN 10 KILOTONNES OF TNT.

UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/52/951
S/1998/515
16 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-second session
Agenda items 10, 81 and 111
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
ON THE WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION
MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 11 June 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I am directed to refer to your telephonic conversation of yesterday with the Prime Minister, and to your letter of 10 June 1998.

I would like to inform you that Pakistan has today officially proposed to the Government of India to resume the Pakistan-India dialogue.

A proposal to this effect was conveyed to the Indian High Commissioner in Islamabad. We have also proposed that the Foreign Secretaries of our two countries give special attention and priority to issues of peace and security and Jammu and Kashmir. We have also indicated to India our readiness to arrive at mutually agreed measures for the avoidance of conflict, nuclear and conventional restraint and stabilization.

We trust that these proposals, which conform to Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's earnest desire to pursue a substantive and result-oriented dialogue with India, will be reciprocated in full.

The Government of Pakistan has also today announced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing. We have expressed our readiness to formalize this arrangement, in the first instance, at the regional level, as an important confidence-building measure with India.

Copies of official statements issued by the Government of Pakistan, in this regard, are enclosed.

We deeply appreciate your efforts at encouraging a substantive and serious peace process between Pakistan and India, which would address all issues, including the core issue of Jammu and Kashmir, in a just and equitable manner.

We look forward to your Personal Envoy's visit to Pakistan next week.

I should be grateful if the contents of the present letter were brought to the attention of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and circulated as documents of those organs.

(Signed) Ahmad KAMAL
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX I

Press statement issued on 11 June 1998 by the Government of Pakistan

On 30 May 1998, the Government of Pakistan had announced that the current series of nuclear tests had been completed. The tests that were conducted on 28 and 30 May 1998 were a natural response, to restore the strategic balance that had been altered by India's nuclear weaponization and subsequent provocative actions and statements against Pakistan.

The Government of Pakistan has repeatedly stated that it does not wish to enter into an arms race with India. Pakistan is making active efforts to ensure avoidance of conflict and to promote nuclear and conventional restraint and stabilization measures between Pakistan and India.

It is in this context that the Government of Pakistan has decided to announce a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing. We are ready to engage constructively with India and other members of the international community to formalize this arrangement. In the first instance, we are ready to arrive at a no-nuclear-test agreement with India, as an important confidence-building measure at the regional level.

The Government of Pakistan expresses the hope that India will reciprocate and contribute towards creating a conducive regional environment by taking further effective steps to overcome the security crisis and promote durable peace and stability in South Asia.

ANNEX II

Press statement issued on 11 June 1998 by the Government of Pakistan

Pakistan's desire to engage constructively in a substantive and result-oriented dialogue with India has repeatedly been affirmed by the Prime Minister.

Accordingly, the Foreign Secretary, today, officially conveyed to the Indian High Commissioner Pakistan's proposal for resumption of Pakistan-India dialogue on the basis of the agreement reached on 23 June 1997 between the two sides.

Pakistan has proposed that, in view of the current situation, the two sides should address, on a priority basis, the issues of peace and security and Jammu and Kashmir in the resumed talks.

Pakistan has also proposed that, under the item pertaining to peace and security, special and urgent attention may be given to arriving at mutually agreed measures for the avoidance of conflict as well as promotion of nuclear and conventional restraint and stabilization measures.

Pakistan believes that simultaneously with the bilateral dialogue the international community will remain engaged with the comprehensive political process of stabilization of nuclearized South Asia and finding of a just settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, as promised by the Foreign Ministers of the five permanent members of the Security Council in their joint communiqué issued at Geneva on 4 June 1998. The Security Council has also mandated the Secretary-General to remain engaged in these efforts. In a letter addressed to the Prime Minister on 10 June, the Secretary-General has offered to encourage and facilitate this process. Islamabad now awaits the visit to Pakistan of the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/516
16 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 16 JUNE 1998 FROM THE CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF GEORGIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit herewith the text of a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia regarding the recent development of events in Abkhazia, Georgia.

May I ask your kind assistance in having the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) George VOLSKI
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

98-16984 (E) 160698

/...

Annex

[Original: Russian]

Statement issued on 14 June 1998 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia expresses its extreme indignation in connection with the developments in the Gali district of Abkhazia, Georgia, where the ethnic cleansing of the Georgian population is continuing openly.

On the morning of 13 June of this year, the so-called Abkhaz militia forces conducted a bandit raid on the village of Gagida. The population of the village was driven out into the streets, and their homes were pillaged and burned down; one resident was killed and five were taken hostage. Many people, including elderly persons and women, were severely beaten.

According to information available as of today, in the Gali district, 1,731 houses have been burned down and industrial installations have been destroyed. Their construction and rebuilding had been made possible, thanks to the untiring assistance provided by international humanitarian organizations and considerable material expenditures.

This latest punitive operation conducted by the Abkhaz separatist leaders is yet another indisputable confirmation of their intention to wreck the negotiation process under way and frustrate the efforts of the world community to salvage from the crisis that has arisen the process of settling the conflict peacefully.

The Government of Georgia is taking all the measures within its power to avert a resumption of armed confrontation, which is being increasingly provoked by the Abkhaz authorities and is creating a real threat to peace and stability in the region.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia expresses its confidence in the ability of international political organizations, first of all, the United Nations and the Commonwealth of Independent States, to assess the situation that has come about and take urgent measures.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/517
16 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 16 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The Iraqi Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, recently wrote to you about the use of depleted uranium (DU)-based ammunition by United Kingdom forces during the 1990/1991 Gulf conflict and the alleged impact on the Iraqi people (S/1998/430). His claims are baseless.

A new 120-mm tank round with a DU core was indeed fired by United Kingdom forces' Challenger 1 tanks in coalition operations to liberate Kuwait in 1991. This ammunition has a unique capability as a kinetic penetrator against modern main battle tank armour. However, this must be seen in its proper context. The British Government's assessment is that United Kingdom tanks fired fewer than 100 DU rounds against Iraqi military forces during hostilities, although additional rounds were fired during earlier work-up training in Saudi Arabia. The United Kingdom armoured forces also operated at a considerable distance from the centres of population in southern Iraq such as Basra, Az-Zubayr and Umm Qasr; after crossing the Saudi Arabian/Iraqi border north of Hafr al Batin, these forces turned east, entered Kuwait and pushed towards Kuwait City.

Mr. Al-Sahaf's letter implies that Her Majesty's Government has only recently admitted to using DU ammunition during the Gulf war. This is not the case. We publicly acknowledged the use of DU-based tank ammunition (rather than missiles) as early as March 1991. This fact is also mentioned in the letter of 6 December 1994 to Sir David Steel from Malcolm Rifkind, the then United Kingdom Secretary of State for Defence, to which Mr. Al-Sahaf's letter refers.

According to Mr. Al-Sahaf, Mr. Rifkind's letter stated that DU rounds "discharge a highly toxic material, which constitutes a health threat". This is not correct. The letter explained that DU rounds can produce "a small amount of radioactive and toxic particulate material when they impact with a hard surface" which "could in the short term form a health risk if inhaled or ingested, although it is unlikely that anyone other than those in the target area would be exposed to large enough quantities of the material for their health to be at risk". This remains our view.

Mr. Al-Sahaf also attributes an increase in ill-health in Iraq, including cancers, to the use of DU ammunition. Her Majesty's Government has seen no

epidemiological research data on the Iraqi population and therefore cannot comment on whether there is an unusually high incidence of ill-health in southern Iraq. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the illnesses of the types listed in Mr. Al-Sahaf's letter are uniquely associated with exposure to DU.

The use of DU rounds by United Kingdom forces was not in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations or any other international agreement and convention. In the use of these rounds and other weaponry, Her Majesty's Government complies strictly with international law.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) John WESTON
Permanent Representative of
the United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
to the United Nations

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/518
16 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON HIS MISSION OF GOOD OFFICES IN CYPRUS

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to paragraph 17 of Security Council resolution 1146 (1997) of 23 December 1997. The report on those aspects of the resolution that relate to the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was submitted to the Council on 10 June (S/1998/488). The present report refers to my mission of good offices.

2. In the last report on my mission of good offices, dated 12 December 1997 (S/1997/973), I stated my commitment to continue the process of good offices following the elections in Cyprus in February 1998. Accompanied by Mr. Diego Cordovez, my Special Adviser on Cyprus, I met on 12 March with the permanent members of the Security Council. While expressing strong support for the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, the permanent members called for urgent action by the United Nations with a view to bringing about the earliest possible resumption of face-to-face talks between the parties.

3. The following day, on the eve of his trip to the region, my Special Adviser briefed the Security Council. He reported that both leaders had agreed to receive him, albeit separately, and stated that the main purpose of the visit was to explore the possibility of resuming face-to-face talks between the two leaders. Following the briefing, the President of the Council made an oral statement reiterating the Council's full support for the Secretary-General's mission of good offices and commending the efforts undertaken by Mr. Cordovez to that end. The Council expressed concern about the high levels of tension on the island and in the region and called upon both sides to take the practical steps necessary to move the negotiation process forward in an effective manner.

4. In letters addressed to the leaders of the two Cypriot communities, dated 26 February, I expressed my strong hope that both sides would spare no effort to reach an agreement with my Special Adviser on the necessary arrangements for a continuing and sustained process of direct negotiations. In two additional letters, delivered to the two leaders personally by Mr. Cordovez, I reiterated the importance I attached to revitalizing negotiations between the two Cypriot communities and called upon the leaders to work wholeheartedly with my Special Adviser to overcome the obstacles which for so long have impeded progress towards a principled and sustainable solution acceptable to the people of Cyprus and to the international community.

5. My Special Adviser visited the island a second time from 18 to 22 March. He met twice with Mr. Clerides, on 20 and 21 March, and three times with Mr. Denktash, on 19, 20 and 21 March. Mr. Clerides reiterated his readiness to resume direct talks under my auspices on the basis of the relevant Security Council resolutions. Mr. Denktash elaborated on his view that it was necessary to adopt a new approach based on the "acknowledgment of the existence of two fully functioning democratic States on the island". Mr. Denktash also requested my Special Adviser to convey his views to the Security Council, and expressed the wish that my Special Adviser arrange a meeting for him to convey this position to me directly. Mr. Cordovez undertook to arrange the meeting. On 28 March, I met with Mr. Denktash at Geneva at his request.

6. Following his visit to Cyprus, my Special Adviser was received in Ankara, by the Prime Minister of Turkey, who expressed his full support for my mission of good offices. A similar statement of support had been conveyed to Mr. Cordovez by the Prime Minister of Greece on an earlier occasion. On his return from Athens and Ankara, my Special Adviser briefed the special envoys and representatives at Geneva on 26 March.

7. On 20 April, in a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1998/410), I reported on my meeting of 28 March with Mr. Denktash and sought any guidance the Council might wish to provide in support of my mission of good offices. On 19 May, in a short reply to my letter, the Council reiterated its strong support for my mission, on the basis of the relevant Security Council resolutions (S/1998/411).

8. In the course of the last six months, as in the past, my Special Adviser and I myself have kept in close touch with the various envoys and representatives involved, particularly those from the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Presidency of the European Union, as well as others with whom my Special Adviser meets regularly for purposes of consultation and cooperation. I should like once again to reiterate my appreciation to all the Governments that have appointed special envoys to assist my good offices mission. They have provided invaluable advice and support to my Special Adviser.

9. It is regrettable that, so far, all these efforts have not proved sufficient to lead to a resumption of the process. I strongly hope that all parties involved will abstain from any action which could further exacerbate tension and I count on their fullest support in the United Nations continuing efforts. In this context, in order to continue to explore possibilities that may lead to a new momentum, my Special Adviser on Cyprus intends to visit the island in the coming weeks.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/519
16 June 1998
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

LETTER DATED 15 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to transmit herewith a statement on the situation in Burundi issued by the Presidency of the European Union.

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) John WESTON
Permanent Representative
of the United Kingdom
to the United Nations

Annex

[Original: English and French]

Statement on the situation in Burundi issued by the Presidency of the European Union

The adoption on 4 June by the National Assembly of Burundi of a Constitutional Act and a political platform for transition is an important step towards peace and national reconciliation in Burundi. It is a significant gesture which offers hope that the Burundians will pursue the efforts which they have begun. This important step towards national reconciliation must be complemented by negotiations between all the Burundi parties without exception, from both inside and outside the country. At this crucial juncture for the future of Burundi, the European Union calls upon all the Burundi parties due to be in Arusha on 15 June in the framework of the regional peace initiative led by the former President of the United Republic of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, to assume the important responsibilities they have to the people of Burundi, who have already endured so much suffering and are hoping for peace.

The Central and Eastern European countries and Cyprus associated with the European Union and the European Free Trade Association countries, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/520
16 June 1998
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

LETTER DATED 15 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to transmit herewith a statement by the Presidency of the European Union on the situation in Guinea-Bissau, issued on 8 June 1998.

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) John WESTON
Permanent Representative
of the United Kingdom
to the United Nations

98-17026 (E) 160698 160698

/...

Annex

[Original: English and French]

Statement on the situation in Guinea-Bissau issued on 8 June 1998 by the Presidency of the European Union

The Presidency, on behalf of the European Union, strongly condemns the attempted military coup by some elements of the armed forces against the duly elected democratic institutions and representatives of Guinea-Bissau.

The European Union wishes to stress that, within a democracy, disputes should only be settled in compliance with democratic principles.

The European Union calls for the rapid re-establishment of constitutional order and security in Guinea-Bissau to prevent further bloodshed, and commends the efforts made by the Guinea-Bissau authorities to avoid any further loss of civilian lives and to ensure protection to all European Union nationals residing in Guinea-Bissau.

The European Union will continue to follow closely events in Guinea-Bissau.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/521
16 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 16 JUNE 1998 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ETHIOPIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

With reference and in response to the letter from the Permanent Representative of Eritrea dated 15 June 1998, and its annex, a statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Eritrea on the same date (S/1998/508), I have the honour to transmit a statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, issued through the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia to the United Nations on 16 June 1998.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Duri MOHAMMED
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-17032 (E) 160698

/...

Annex

Press statement issued on 16 June 1998 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia

Asmara trying to deceive the international community on the nature of the moratorium on air strikes

It must be stated quite categorically that the crisis between Ethiopia and Eritrea, growing out of the invasion of Ethiopian sovereign territory by Eritrea, has continued to deteriorate day by day and, despite the misleading information from Asmara, the latest being the statement issued by their Foreign Ministry on 15 June 1998, there has been absolutely no change for the better in this military confrontation imposed on Ethiopia. In fact, what one can conclude from the behaviour in Asmara and from their continuing attempt to deceive the international community is that there is yet no preparedness on the part of the Eritrean authorities to withdraw from the Ethiopian territory that they have occupied by force.

In the above-mentioned statement of 15 June by the Eritrean Foreign Ministry, Asmara attempts to deceive the international community and its own people by suggesting that there was "agreement with Ethiopia on a partial cessation of hostilities as a positive and first step towards ending the war".

As should be obvious to all following this tragic development, Ethiopia has never as yet taken any military initiative of its own, even in self-defence, either on the ground or in the air. What it has done so far has been to respond to the various military moves, on the ground and in the air, launched by the Eritrean authorities. Ethiopia has taken no initiative of its own. Not yet. Whether Ethiopia does this or not wholly depends on whether there is a possibility for ensuring the withdrawal of Eritrean troops from Ethiopian territory peacefully, as has been proposed by the facilitators and as was endorsed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

As long as there is a glimmer of hope that the territorial integrity of Ethiopia would be restored peacefully, Ethiopia would continue to exercise self-restraint, because Ethiopia's objective is the restoration of its dignity and not the means by which this is achieved, though the peaceful method is its priority.

Accordingly, Ethiopia has, at the behest of friendly Governments, most particularly of the United States of America, agreed to a unilateral moratorium on air strikes as long as it is not put in a situation, by the activities of the aggressors, requiring it to respond in kind.

This is not, by any stretch of the imagination, "a positive and first step towards ending the war", as the Eritrean authorities would like the international community to believe. This is a lie and a fabrication designed to mislead the international community as well as its own people. For Eritrea to suggest that there is an agreement "with Ethiopia on a partial cessation of

hostilities" shows how the Eritrean authorities are totally incapable of learning from their mistakes and how their every step and every utterance should be followed with care.

The Foreign Ministry of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, therefore, wishes to reiterate that the crisis between Ethiopia and Eritrea, far from having shown any improvement, is in fact worsening by the day. For Ethiopia, the bottom line is the liberation of its land, first and foremost. Aggressors cannot and should not be rewarded. Eritrea did not invade Ethiopian territory by mistake and it did not stumble into a quagmire unwittingly. They launched the invasion to create illegal facts on the ground, believing that this time around as well they could get away with creating a fait accompli on a peace-loving country. They are used to invading countries and inviting them to talk. Ethiopia has declined the invitation. First, because it is a matter of dignity for Ethiopia and its people. Secondly, because it is a matter for Ethiopia of discharging its responsibility for protecting principles of international law governing inter-State relations. The Eritrean authorities should be told enough is enough. Therefore, the insinuation on the part of the Eritrean authorities that Ethiopia is backtracking on these commitments is a lie and an insult to the intelligence of the international community.

Ethiopia has said, as long as there is a glimmer of hope for resolving the crisis peacefully, it would give peace a chance. Thus, the unilateral moratorium on air strikes. It is important therefore for the international community to convey a clear message to the Eritrean authorities that the only remaining opportunity for averting a disaster is for both parties to cooperate with the facilitators and to accept and implement the proposal made by the same. This is what the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its thirty-fourth session has appealed to them to do. Eritrea should be prevailed upon to comply with this voice of Africa at the highest level.

In this context, if Ethiopia is convinced at any time that peace has no chance and that the Eritrean authorities have closed all doors to reason, then Ethiopia would exercise its legitimate right of self-defence by utilizing whatever capacity it has on the ground or in the air for the purposes of achieving this noble and just objective.

Therefore, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia would like to advise all those with interest in this crisis imposed on Ethiopia that the statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Eritrea on 15 June 1998 is based on lies and pure fabrication and is intended to confuse the international community and create a false sense of normalcy for its own people.